



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

in Livy, designed apparently to be complete. The material is arranged for the most part under a purely formal system of classification with the following main rubrics: I, Direct Discourse: A, Indicative Protases, (a) Indicative Apodoses (hereunder the grouping is by tense, thus: *present-present*; *present-perfect*; *present-future*; *present-future perfect*; *perfect-present*; *perfect-perfect*, etc.); (b) Subjunctive Apodoses (with subclassification by tense as above); (c) Imperative Apodoses (tense as above). B, Subjunctive Protases (with (a), (b), (c) as above, and corresponding subgrouping by tense). At this point are interpolated the clauses introduced by *sin* (and *sin minus*, *sin autem*), in both direct and indirect discourse. II, Indirect Discourse (with subgrouping by tense). III, A, Parenthetic Conditions. Under this rubric the author combines the formal categories of classification with other forms of description, such as "a sort of causal interjection giving the piously or politely assumed basis of action" (*si dis placet*, *si videtur*, *si vultis*, *si licet*, etc.), and "polite substitutes for direct relative clauses," as *iniurias si quae forte fuerunt*. Here he groups separately conditions introduced by *nisi* and especially *nisi quod*, adding as a pendant to them the frequently occurring clauses introduced by *praeterquam quod*. Sec. III, B, Comparative Conditional, is again formally subdivided (*quasi*, *tamquam*, *velut*, *ut*). The enumeration concludes with III, C, Concessive (1 *quamquam*, 2 *etsi*, 3 *etiamsi*, 4 *quamvis*, 5 *modo dummodo*). Some statistical tables are given. The work appears to bear clear evidences of the influence of the method of investigation elucidated in Morris' *Methods and Principles of Latin Syntax*. The work of collection and collation appears to be done carefully and conscientiously. Although the author has here and there interspersed comments and observations, most of those who use the book will value it chiefly as presenting a broad panorama of Livy's usage of conditional sentences.

C. L. MEADER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

---

*Latin Terms of Endearment and of Family Relationship: A Lexicographical Study Based on Vol. VI of the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.* By SAMUEL GLENN HARROD. Princeton Dissertation. Princeton, N.J.: The Falcon Press, 1909.

The purpose of this dissertation is "to gain from a study of the Latin inscriptions additional information in regard to the use and meaning of two groups of words: terms of endearment and names of family relationship." It is based upon inscriptions from the city of Rome, over 36,700 in number, covering a period from the second century B.C. to the sixth century A.D.

The words *merens* and *meritus* occur with such frequency that the author has not thought it advisable to collect all the instances, but he estimates that they occur 8,000 times. *Carissimus* is found 1,713 times, *dulcissimus* 1,634. Nineteen other adjectives are listed, ranging from *pietissimus*, 907 instances,

to *praestantissimus* with 21. One hundred and twenty-eight others are of still rarer occurrence. In most cases the author gives full lists, showing (1) spellings and abbreviations (a brief discussion of the latter is found on p. 51); (2) collocation, including word order, phrases, nouns and other adjectives used with the epithet; (3) meaning. All this is followed by deductions, such, for instance, as these: "The average age of the son to whom the epithet *carissimus* is applied is 11½ years, the average age of the daughter, 9½" (p. 6). "Everything points to the conclusion that *dulcissimus* is the particular epithet, not only of children, but of younger children" (p. 10). "*Sanctissimus* is distinctively the epithet of women" (p. 22).

A statistical tabulation (p. 49) yields, by a simple method of calculation, results showing "normal frequency of application" and "actual frequency," thereby indicating "with accuracy the preferences shown in the use of the various terms of endearment" (p. 48).

As was to be expected from the usage of prose literature, superlatives predominate over positives. Under *pius* it is stated that "there is a noticeable tendency to heap up the positive forms. There appears to have been an attempt to compensate for the omission of superlative forms by the use of a greater number of positive forms" (p. 26).

Chap. ii deals with terms of family relationship, and the material is handled in much the same way as in chap. i. *Genitor* (p. 52), *genetrix* (p. 54), *natus* (p. 75), *nata* (p. 78) are found chiefly in metrical inscriptions. "We are probably safe in saying that *coniunx* designates husband three times as often as all other words put together" (p. 64). "*Coniunx* is used by high and low alike" (p. 64), both as masculine and as feminine (p. 67). *Maritus* is used for husband in about 12 per cent of the cases (p. 65). "*Uxor* stands second [to *coniunx*, p. 67] in point of frequency among the words used to designate the wife" (p. 69). "No epithet of endearment is applied to the uncle," who is mentioned 28 times (p. 58). "Only once [out of 11 occurrences] is an endearing epithet applied to the stepfather" (p. 59; per contra, see Pliny *Ep.* ii. 13). "The only expression of love for a mother-in-law [*socrus* occurs 4 times and circumlocutions 8 times] is found in [CIL. VI] 5,570. . . . Here the wife not only calls her husband's mother *carissima*, but also speaks of her as *mater*" (p. 60).

We gather from the author's silence that several words do not occur at all in the whole bulk of 36,700 inscriptions: *fratria*, *glos* (8 circumlocutions occur, for three kinds of sisters-in-law), *leuir* (10 circumlocutions are found for three kinds of brothers-in-law); the rare *iamitricēs* and terms for remote relationships were not to be expected.

Glaring misprints are only too common in the expository part (e.g., 3,600 instead of 36,000, p. 1; *exopatissimus* followed by a quoted *exoptatissimo*, p. 44; illigetimate, p. 74; inscriptives, pp. 76, 85; apprentice, p. 83); these raise at once the more serious question of the accuracy of the proofreading in the mass of quotations from the inscriptions themselves. *Mellitissima* is

quoted, p. 45, as in *CIL*. VI 28, 720, and again, p. 61, correctly as in 28,120. On p. 60, line 5, the husband's age is given as LXV, and that of the mother-in-law as XXXXI, exactly interchanging the numerals as given in *CIL*. VI, 5,570. It is also to be regretted that the author of a dissertation of this sort is not surer of himself in his use of "shall" and "will."

In pleasant relief from the statistical part of the dissertation stand certain striking expressions of human interest, such as are inevitably brought out by any extended investigation of Latin inscriptions, in strong contrast to the more perfunctory or stereotyped formulae (cf. Cagnat, *Revue de philologie*, XIII, 1899, 51 ff.). *Dulcis anima* = father (p. 55); *pater et filius* = père et fils (p. 53). "The words *senior* and *iunior* appear in contrast 7 times"; in six of these the father and son are probably meant, and in the seventh the older and the younger son is referred to (p. 53). *Causa uitae* stands for father (p. 53) or for mother (p. 55). "A wife is styled *anima* 7 times . . . *uita* once" (p. 70). *Parentes* occurs frequently with "a wider meaning than parents" (p. 56), as in all Romance languages today. *Unanimis* describes both husband and wife (p. 46; cf. Catullus, 9. 4). A son is called *liber*, once certainly (18,611), a second instance (21,412) being more doubtful (cf. *pater conscriptus*, Cic. *Phil.* 13. 28). He is also called *amor* (p. 76), *issulus* (p. 76), *refrigerium* (= "comfort," solace, p. 77—used also of a daughter, p. 78). "The alumna is called *domina*; *anima innocentissima*; and *anima incomparabilis*" (p. 86). A brother is styled *anima innocens* (p. 61).

The epitaph of Minicia Marcella (*CIL*. VI, 16,631) affords no material for Dr. Harrod's dissertation. That of the "sightly dame" Claudia (I, 1,007; VI, 15,346) is cited only for the sake of the spelling *gnatos*; but it is recalled (p. 43) by 11,602 and 34,045, both of Amydone, daughter of Marcus, wife of Barbarus, who was

*lanífica, pia, pudica, frúgi, cásta, dómisedá.*

The *Laudatio Turiae* (VI, 1,527) yields only scanty material. It scarcely seems necessary or right to discount the meaning of *obsequentissimus*, as the author appears to do (p. 45, cf., p. 76) in 20,158: *P. Iulio. P. [f] Nomaeo | filio . optumo | reuerentissimo | obsequentissimoq | huius . q. loci . totius | domino | uix . ann . xv . m . x . d . xxiv | P. Iul. L[y]s[i]ponus | pat.*

ARTHUR WINFRED HODGMAN

STATE UNIVERSITY  
COLUMBUS, OHIO  
February 3, 1912